

**REMARKS**

Claims 67-83 were pending in this application when the present Final Office Action was mailed (November 29, 2005). In this paper, claims 75, 78, 79, and 83 have been amended, and claims 77 and 82 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 67-76 and 78-81, and 83 are presently pending.

In the November 28, 2005 Final Office Action, claims 75, 76, 80, and 82 were rejected, and claims 67-74 were allowed. More specifically, the status of the application in light of the Final Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 75, 76, 80 and 82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,360,516 to Haywood ("Haywood");

(B) Claims 77-79, 81 and 83 were subject to objections as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form; and

(C) Claims 67-74 have been allowed.

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone interview on February 23, 2006. During the telephone interview, the Examiner and the applicants' representative discussed the claimed subject matter and the cited reference – Haywood. The following remarks reflect and expand upon the foregoing discussions during the February 23 telephone interview. As such, the applicants request that this paper also constitutes the applicants' interview summary.

A. Response to the Section 102(b) Rejection

Claims 75, 76, 80 and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Haywood. Claim 82 has been canceled without prejudice, so the Section 102(b) rejection of claim 82 is now moot. Even though applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner regarding the Section 102(b) rejections of claims 75, 76, and 80, applicants have amended claim 75 to incorporate the features of allowable claim 77. As

a result, claim 75 is allowable over Haywood. Claims 76 and 80 are allowable over Haywood as depending from claim 75 and because these claims contain additional features. Accordingly, the Section 102(b) rejections of claims 75, 76, and 80 should be withdrawn.

**B. Response to the Objections to Claims 77-79, 81 and 83**

Claims 77-79, 81 and 83 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 77 has been canceled, so the objection to claim 77 is now moot. Claims 78 and 79 have been rewritten in independent forms, so amended claims 78 and 79 are allowable. As discussed above, amended claim 75 is allowable over Haywood, and claims 81 and 83 depend from claim 75. Accordingly, the objections to claims 78-79, 81 and 83 should be withdrawn.

**C. Allowable Subject Matter**

Allowed claims 67-74 have not been amended in this response.

**D. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims patentably define over the applied art. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned representative at (206) 359-6038.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**


**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE – Art Unit 1734**

Attorney Docket No. 108298404US2

Disclosure No. 99-0319.02/US

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Chen Liang

Registration No. 51,945

Date: 2/28/06

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096

Perkins Coie LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000